A

Sixth LETTER,

Concerning the

Sacred Trinity;

IN

ANSWER

To a Book Entituled,

OBSERVATIONS

ON THE

Four Letters, &c.

By *JOHN WALLIS*, D. D.
Professor of Mathematicks in *Oxford.*

LONDON:
Printed for *Tho. Parkhurst*, at the *Bible* and *Three Crowns*, in *Cheapside*, 1691.

UMI

A

Sixth LETTER,

Concerning the

Sacred Trinity;

IN

ANSWER

To a Book Entitulee,

OBSERVATIONS

ON THE

Four Letters, &c.

By JOHN WALLIS, D.D.
Professor of Mathematicks in Oxford.

LONDON:
Printed for Tho. Parkhurst, at the Bible and Three Crowns, in Cheapside, 1691.

A Sixth LETTER Concerning the Sacred Trinity.

SIR,

I Find from my *Socinian* Adverſary, *Obſervations* (as he calls it) *on my Four Letters*; (He might have ſaid *Five*, if he pleaſed.) Which I ſaw not till Yeſterday, *Mar.* 13. Nor do I ſee any great need of publiſhing a haſty Anſwer. There being ſo little in it that deſerves an Anſwer, which had not been anſwered before it was written. And I may perhaps ere long meet with ſome ſuch like *Obſervations* upon my *Fifth*; and then I may at once Anſwer both.

His firſt head he calls *The Deſign of the Letters.*

That which I undertook to maintain, was clearly ſtated thus, That *it is not Inconſiſtent with natural Reaſon, that there may be Three Somewhats which are but One God; And that what in one regard are Three, may in another regard be One.* To prove this (and this only) I brought thoſe Arguments or Inſtances at which he cavils.

This he now tells me (p. 4.) *The Socinians will grant me this.* (That is, they grant what I undertook to prove.) And *of which,* he ſays, *no Man ever was ſo fooliſh as to doubt.* And my *Arian* Adverſary in like manner, (in his *Anſwer,* p. 3. and his *Vindication,* p. 3, 5.) that *none but a Madman would ever deny it.* And that *he cannot ſay, there is any Contradiction in ſaying, there may be three Perſons in God.* Thus far therefore we are agreed on all hands.

But he now tells me, p. 4. That *this is not the Queſtion.* Yes; this is the Queſtion that I undertook. 'Tis true, there be other Queſtions between us and the *Socinians.* But *the Queſtion I undertook* was that. And he knows it was ſo.

Well; but what ſays he, is the Queſtion? 'Tis this he ſays (p. 4.) *Whether there be Three Gods, or but One God.* No: this is not the Queſtion. For in this we are agreed alſo. *The Socinians* (he ſays) *affirm There is but One God.* And ſo do I.

The Propoſition, he ſays, *which (in favour of the Trinity) I ſhould have proved,* (that is, the taſk he lets me, not what I undertook) was this, *That what are in one regard Three, may in another regard be SO One, that all of them (together) are but One, and yet each of them (ſingly, and by it ſelf) is that One.*

Now, I think, I had proved this; This *corpus longum, corpus latum,* and *corpus profundum,* is *One Cube.* The *corpus longum* is a *Cube*; the *corpus latum* is a *Cube,* and the *corpus profundum* is a *Cube*: and yet this *Corpus longum, latum & profundum,* is (altogether) but *One Cube.*

But this is Latin: And his Challenge is, (p. 5.) *Shew me that Trinitarian that dares diſpute the Queſtion in plain Engliſh.* I'll endeavour that too. *David the Son of Jeſſe* was a *Man*; and *David King of Iſrael* was

was a *Man*; and *David the Father of Solomon* was a *Man*: Yet *David the Son of Jesse, the King of Israel, and Father of Solomon*, was (altogether) but *One Man*. And this is *plain English*, without the words of *Abstract, Concrete, Paternity, Personality*, (at which he there cavils,) or other hard words than what his *Tankard-bearer* might understand.

Well but (says he) *We may indeed say, This long body is a Cube*; meaning thereby, *This long body, which is also broad and high, is a Cube; and if it were not broad and high it were not a Cube: But we cannot say so here.* I'll try if I cannot hit this too. The *All-wise God*, is *God All-sufficient*; the *Almighty God*, is *God All-sufficient*; the *Everlasting God*, is *God All-sufficient*: meaning by *the All-wise God*, the God who is also *Almighty* and *Everlasting*; and if he were not also *Almighty and Everlasting*, he were not *All-sufficient*. Yet this *All-wise, Almighty, and Everlasting God*, is (altogether) but *One God All-sufficient*.

But supposing (says he) *the Doctor's Instances do satisfy this difficulty*, (as I think they do;) *Does he not know there are many more*, (Yes, he doth know it) *to which these Instances are not applicable?* Very true. And therefore they were not brought to prove all points which concern the Trinity. They were brought to prove this point in particular, That *it is not Inconsistent with Reason, that Three Somewhats may be One God*. And if they prove this, it is what they were brought to prove. (When I undertake other points, I may use other Arguments.) And this hath been said so often, that (if he have any thing else of moment to say) it is strange, that repeating the same Objection (without any further strength) he should put me so often to give the same Answer.

His next head is *Of Somewhats and Persons*.

We are told, that *Christ and the Father are one*, Joh. 10. 30. And *these Three are One*, 1 Joh. 5. 7, without giving a

name

name to *these Three*. Nor what shall we call them? *These three*---- what? Not *three Gods*; for that's false. (There is but *One* God.) And *three Persons* he will not allow me to call them, because it is not a Scriptural Word. (*Person* he grants is Scriptural, *Heb.* 1. 3. but not *Persons*.) I must not call them *three Nothings*. (For certainly it was never meant to be thus understood, *These three Nothings are One*: And when Christ said *I and the Father are One*, he did not mean *We two Nothings are One*.) And if they be not *Nothing*, they must be *Somewhat*; and *Three such*, must be *three Somewhats*. And I could not think of a more *Innocent* word, to design them by. And therefore (that we might not quarrel about words) I was content to wave the name of *Persons*, and (without fixing a new name on them) design them by the word *Somewhat*. (Presuming that those who do not take them to be *Nothing*, would allow them to be *Somewhat*.) But neither will this word pass with him.

Now this is a hard case. The Scripture says *These Three*, without giving them a *Name*. And then, *We* must not give them a Name; because that Name will be *unscriptural*. And yet if we do *not* give them a Name; he tells us, They be Three Somewhats, *without Name or Notion*: And that no two can *agree, what this is*, or *what is thereby meant*; but *as many Writers, so many Explications*. p. 8. 16.

To which I say; As to the *Notion*, I think the Orthodox are all, thus far, agreed; That they are Three such *Somewhats* in God, as differ from each other more than what we commonly call the *Divine Attributes*, but not so as to be *Three Gods*. And though (within these limits) divers men may diversly express themselves, yet in this *Notion* the Orthodox I think do all agree. And this I had before declared, (*Def.* iv. *p.* 37.) though he please to take no notice of it. (So that we are not without a

Notion

Notion of it.) And if he will allow us to give a *Name* to it; that Name (whatever it be) is so to be understood as to denote *this Notion*. And we think the word *Person*, a fit *Name* to denote this *Notion* by. But if we may not give it a *Name*; we must then say, The *Notion* is such as (was but now explained. But they will not allow us to give it a *Name*. And as to our Agreement or Disagreement, I think the *Trinitarians* do less disagree amongst themselves, than do the *Anti-trinitarians*.

But he says, (p. 9.) *I own the word Persons (when applied to God) to be but Metaphorical; and not to signifie just the same as when applied to Men, but somewhat Analogous thereunto.* True; I do so. And I have given my Reasons why I do so, more than once. Because Two of them being represented to us in Scripture under the Names of *Father*, and *Son*, and this Son said to *be begotten* of that Father: (which words are therefore not to be quarrelled with, because Scripture Language:) No man thinks that the one is *so a Father*, or the other *so a Son*, or *so Begotten*, as these words signifie concerning *Men*; but somewhat *Analogous* thereunto. And in what sense they are *Father and Son*, they are (in a sense analogous thereunto) *Two Persons*, and the *Holy Ghost* a *Third*. For *Father* and *Son* in a proper sense amongst men, are such *Relatives* as the Latins did denote by the word *Persona* in the first and proper signification of that word: And consequently *Father* and *Son* in this Analogical sense, are (in a continuation of the same Analogy) *Persons* in a like Analogical sense.

But he says further, that in the explication of the *Athanasian* Creed, (Let. in. p. 13.) I interpret τρεις ὑποστασεις, by *truly Persons*, or *properly Persons*. I do so: Because I suppose it was intended to call them truly or properly *such* persons as are there meant, (answering to the Greek Hypostases;) that is in such a sense as they are there

there called *Father* and *Son*, and that the word *Person* is a *true and proper* Continuation of the same Analogy.

I have before declared, more than once, (in the places by him cited, *p.* 9, 10.) that the true and proper sense of the Latin word *Persona*, is not to denote a *Man* simply (for this with them was *Homo*, not *Persona*,) but such *quality*, *state*, or *condition* of a man, whereby he is distinguished from, or stands related to, other men. As a *King*, a *Father*, a *Judge*, and the like. And accordingly the *same Man*, may sustain divers *Persons*. (He may be a *King*, and a *Father*.) And according as such *Condition* varies, the *Person* also varies. 'Tis true that in *English*, (for want of a word that answers to *Homo*,) we sometimes make use of the word *Person*, when we speak indifferently of *Man*, *Woman*, or *Child*; as when a *Man*, or *Woman*, and an *Infant* are spoken of as *three Persons*: But these the Latins would not have called *tres Personæ*, but *tres Homines*. (But if consider'd as *Father*, *Mother*, and *Child*, they may, as thus related, be called *tres Personæ*.) And the Schoolmen sometimes (and some others in imitation of them) do in a like sense use the word *Persona*, for want of a Latin word which did indifferently respect *Men* and *Angels*. But these are new senses of the word *Persona* quite different from what the word signified in the purity of the Latin Tongue; and unknown (I suppose) to the Fathers, who first applied the word *Persona* to those of the Sacred Trinity: As I had before shewed at large. *Letter*, *p.* 15. *&c.*

But at this rate, he tells us, (*p.* 10.) *The Socinians will allow, God the Creator, God the Redeemer, and God the Sanctifier, or God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, to be Three Persons.* And I am not sorry to hear it. But then I would not have him say (as here) that I make them to be only *Three Names*, nor yet (as *p.* 16.) *three Gods*. They are more than *three Names*, but not *Three Gods*. For

even

even amongſt men, to be a *Father*, is more than a *Name*, or *Title*; And, in the Godhead, the *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy-Ghoſt*, differ more than ſo many *Names*. And, though I will not take upon me to determine preciſely, how great the *Diſtinction* is, (which is what at *p.* 8. he cites out of my *Let.* ii. *p.* 3.) becauſe I would not be poſitive where the Scripture is ſilent; yet certainly 'tis not ſo great as to make them *Three Gods*, but greater than merely *three Names*, or even that between what we commonly call the *Divine Attributes*.

His next Head is about my *Explication of the Athanaſian Creed*. Which he finds (he ſays) to be an *Explication of the Damnatory Clauſes* therein. And he is not much amiſs in that obſervation. He was told ſo in the firſt words of that *Explication*, and in the laſt words of the *Poſtſcript*, That it was *in purſuance of a clauſe in a former Letter* to that purpoſe; and that (though other things are explained in it) *it was chiefly intended for the Satisfaction of thoſe who do believe the Doctrine of it*, (but ſtumbled at thoſe Clauſes,) to ſhew that they need not (for theſe Clauſes) to reject that Creed.

He tells us (*p.* 11.) *there is a difference between Neceſſary and Requiſite.* Be it ſo. But the word there is χρὴ, *oportet* (not ἀναγκαῖον) which I had rendred (*p.* 4. 21.) by theſe words, *It is neceſſary, it is mainly neceſſary, 'tis a principal requiſite, he ought* to believe it. And certainly, if he had not a great deſire to cavil he would not have quarrelled at this expoſition, as not full enough for the word χρὴ.

I had ſaid, this Creed was *part* of the Catholick Faith; the *whole* of which I took to be the *whole word of God*: which a man is obliged to believe as to the *Subſtantials* of it; but may *be ſaved* notwithſtanding *an Ignorance or Miſtake as to ſome Particulars of leſſer moment*. Now he would have it to be underſtood, that *this Creed* is the whole, not

 only

only a Part of the Catholick Faith; that *nothing must be added to it, nothing taken from it*: And that *every Man and Woman shall perish everlastingly who doth not believe and profess this, without taking ought from it, or adding ought to it.* Why I think otherwise, I have shewed before, and need not repeat it. But leave it to the Reader to judge, whether this or that be likelier to be true. And, whether he take it to be the meaning of this writer, That all must needs be damned, who lived and died before this Creed was written; or who possibly never saw it or heard of it, (though they should believe all the Substantials of the Christian Faith, or Word of God, and held nothing destructive of it;) or, who do not believe just so much and no more. But if that be his opinion, he doth interpret it more severely against himself than I would have done; or (I think) any Man who had not a mind to cavil.

His next head is, about *the Opinions charged upon Socinus and the Socinians.* Concerning which, I do not think it needful to trouble the Reader with repeating what I had said of those Opinions, *Let.* iii. p. 44, 45, 46, 47, 48. and *Let.* iv. p. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. or what he now brings in excuse of it. But shall leave it to the Reader, to judge (upon what is said on both sides) whether I have not thereby fully proved the charge; of the slight Opinion they have of the Scripture (in competition with Reason) when it crosses any of their beloved Tenets. And yet, if that be not enough, himself directs, *p.* 16. to *Maresius* and *Lubertus*, where (it seems) is more to be found to the same purpose.

But his Plea for himself, *p.* 16. I do admit. That *if Socinus have spoken erroneously, or unadvisedly, or hyperbolically*, he is not obliged to defend it (nor do I know that he is obliged to be a *Socinian.*) He may renounce of *Socinus*, what he pleases.

Whether

Whether he who defended the *Theſis* at *Franeker*, were a Profeſſed *Socinian*, or but covertly ſo, I cannot tell (becauſe I do not know the Man:) But I do not think it more ſtrange, to find a *Socinian* at *Franeker* (notwithſtanding the *Synod* of *Dort*) than at *London*. And ſometime (*p.* 16.) he will hardly allow himſelf a *Socinian*, nor any of his Party. But I hope he will not deny *Socinus* to have been a *Socinian*. Therefore ſo far, at leaſt, I was right.

But he would not have me *blacken a man, long ſince dead, who never did me any injury.* Very well; He had before challenged me to maintain my charge againſt the *Socinians*: And he now quarrels with me for ſo doing. He will now hardly allow any to be a *Socinian* but *Socinus* himſelf; and yet I muſt not blacken *Socinus*. What am I then to do? I will even leave it as it is, and let the Reader judge. And if he doubt, whether I, or my Adverſary be more fair in our Quotations; let him conſult the places and judge accordingly. And particularly that of *Epiſt.* 5. *ad Volkelium*. I am at preſent not at home, nor have Books about me. But ſure I am, that *Socinus* doth there (a few lines before what this Obſervator repeats) directly deny, that *the Soul after death doth ſubſiſt*; according as I had affirmed (though I cannot now recite the whole Sentence becauſe I have not the Book at hand.) But this the Repeater (whether by *Docking* or *Decapitation*) thinks fit to omit. And then I preſume the Reader will then find, that *per ſe* is not meant *ſo by it ſelf, or of his own nature, as not by the gift and grace of God*, (for ſo it might as well be ſaid of the Soul *before* death,) but, *ſo by it ſelf as not in conjunction with the body*; and then the ſenſe muſt be, that though the Soul with the Body be *premiorum & pœnarum capax*, yet the Soul *of it ſelf* without the Body, is not ſo. But I leave this, and the reſt, wholly to the Readers Judgment, to judge (upon view)

as he ſhall ſee cauſe. Adding this alſo, that he will find it is not onely as to this Point of the *Trinity*, that *Socinus* diſcovers ſo ſlight an opinion of the Scriptures in competition with Reaſon; but in other Points alſo where they do not favour his opinions.

He had told us before, of ſome body at *Oxford*, who, maintaining a *Theſis* againſt the *Socinians*, was baffled by his Opponent. Who or when this was he had not told us; nor what that *Theſis* was. He now tells us, *p.* 16. It was *a Theſis againſt the Socinians, that they preferred Reaſon before Scripture.* Perhaps, when he recollects himſelf, (or conſults his Informer,) he may find (if any ſuch thing happened as he ſuggeſts) it was on ſome *other Theſis*; and not *againſt the Socinians*, but *againſt the Arminians.* But, be it as he ſays; I know nothing of it, and ſhall not concern my ſelf about it.

But in requital of this ſtory I told him another of *Sandius*, who having propoſed a Challenge, upon his *Problema Paradoxum* (contrary to the *Divinity of the Holy-Ghoſt*) was ſo anſwered by *Wittichius*, that (as appears by a Printed Letter publiſhed by his Friend and Partner in that Diſputation) they were ſo convinced, as to change their opinion. I now add, that it ſo appears, not only by his Friend's Printed Letter: but by another of *Sandius* himſelf to *Wittichius*; which I have not ſeen (and I think it was never printed,) but the Contents of it may be ſeen in another Treatiſe of *Wittichius*, with this Title, *Cauſa Spiritus Sancti Victrix.* Printed at *London*, 1682.

But *this matter* (he ſays) *is both Unskilfully and Unfairly related.* Why *unskilfully?* why *unfairly?* He ſays, *Sandius was an Arian*; (Be it ſo:) *not a Socinian.* Very well: Nor did I ſay that he was; but *a Friend of the Socinians.* He was an *Anti-trinitarian*; and did promote (againſt the *Trinitarians*) the common cauſe of *Arians* and

and *Socinians*, (though theſe perhaps might quarrel amongſt themſelves.) But this *Obſervator* thought (it ſeems) becauſe I did not *call* him an *Arian*, that I did not *know* him ſo to be. And this (I gueſs) is what he calls *unskilful*. But I can give him a better reaſon why I ſhould not call him ſo. I did not then know I ſhould have an *Arian* Adverſary to deal with, (for my *Arian* Adverſary did not yet appear:) But my *Socinian* Adverſary was already upon the ſtage, and with him I was now dealing. Yet I could not ſay that *Sandius* was a *Socinian*, but (that the *Socinian* might be concern'd in the ſtory) I ſaid, He was a *Friend of theirs*. And what *Unskilfulneſs* appears in this? Had I then known (what ſince I do) that I was to be attacqued by an *Arian* alſo; I ſhould rather have called him an *Anti-trinitarian*, which had been common to both: But, knowing then of none but a *Socinian* Adverſary, I choſe to call him *a Friend of theirs*. Which was neither *Unfair* nor *Unskilful*.

Perhaps he thinks if not *Unskilful*, 'twas at beſt *Unfair* to ſay that his Partner and He *changed their opinion*. But was it not ſo? doth not his Aſſociate expreſly tell us (in the very Title-page of his Letter of thanks for thoſe Animadverſions) *per quas (animadverſiones) errores ſuos rejicere coactus eſt?* (whereby he was conſtrained to relinquiſh his Errors?) Well, but did they change *all* their *Opinions?* did they relinquiſh *all* their *Errors?* I believe not: But, that opinion which was then in diſpute; his *Problema Paradoxum*, and the *Errors* therein. And, if he conſult the Book, he'll find it was ſo: And, that this *Paradox* was it which he did relinquiſh. And, what his Paradox was, he might there ſee it as well as I. Nor had he told me, *who*, and *when*, and *upon what Queſtion*, his ſuppoſed *Anti-Socinian* was baffled by his Opponent? or, how I might come to know it? (And even now, when he pretends to tell me the Queſtion, I doubt he is miſtaken

ken therein. But what *Unfairneſs* was there in all this? when I had told him where he might find as much of it as I could tell him.

But he tells us now, that *Sandius was ſatisfied* indeed (as to the Point then in queſtion,) but *not of the Divinity of the Holy Spirit*. Nor did I ſay that he was. But I can tell him, That he was nearer, even to this, than our Obſervator was aware, or at leaſt nearer than he thinks fit to own to us. If he conſult *Wittichius*'s latter Treatiſe, entituled *Cauſa Spiritûs Sancti Victrix*, he will there find an Extract of a Manuſcript Letter of *Sandius* to him. In which, to the beſt of my remembrance (for I have not here the Book at hand) he tells *Wittichius* to this Purpoſe. "That whereas in his *Problema Paradoxum* "he had been of opinion that by the *Holy Spirit* might "be meant *the whole number of good Angels*, he did not "now think ſo well of that opinion, as before their Diſ- "putation: but was conſidering of two other opinions "to be ſubſtituted inſtead thereof: That by the *Holy-* "*Ghoſt* might be meant, not the *whole number* of good "Angels, as before; but either ſome *ſelect number* of "them, as being a ſuperiour Order; or elſe ſome *One* "*Angel* as ſuperiour to all the reſt. (Which two he ſug- "geſts to *Wittichius*'s further conſideration.) But, if "neither of theſe ſhould ſucceed (as he doubted they "would not;) he was then inclinable to ſay, with "him: That the *Holy-Ghoſt* was, indeed, the ſame *Eter-* "*nal God* with the *Father* and the *Son*. If in reciting this by memory, I have failed in any conſiderable Circumſtance, I ſubmit it to be rectified by the Book. But if our *Obſervator* have ſeen that Treatiſe, and knows it thus to be, I think we have more reaſon to complain of *Unfairneſs*, in his repreſenting it as he doth: As if he remained fixed in this Opinion, That the *Holy-Ghoſt* was ſo a Perſon *as the Arians always held*.

I am

I am ſorry to detain the Reader by following our *Obſervator* in his ſo many long excurſions which do ſo little concern the Buſineſs before us. For what (almoſt) of what hath been hitherto mentioned of his, doth tend to the confutation of what we affirm; That what we call *Three Perſons*, are more than *Three Names*, but not *Three Gods*.

In *(part of)* his two laſt leaves, he would ſeem to come ſomewhat nearer to the Buſineſs, but not much. He tells us, *p.* 17. that *Luther* and *Calvin* did not like the word *Trinity*. It may be ſo. (I'll take his word for it without ſeeking the places; becauſe I do not think it worth while.) That they ſay 'tis *Barbarous* and *ſounds odly* (I ſuppoſe he knows that by a *Barbarous* word, is commonly meant, a word not uſed by *Claſſick Authors*, or not agreeable to the *uſual forms of ſpeech* in Latin and Greek Writers.) Be it ſo. (And what if I had ſaid ſo too?) Suppoſe a *Hunter* ſhould ſay, a *Trinity* of Hares *ſounds odly*, and another ſay the like of a *Leaſh*, and chooſe rather to ſay (in plain Engliſh) *Three hares*: the ſenſe is ſtill the ſame. And if *Calvin* (who loved a *ſmooth* ſtile, and *pure-Latin* words,) ſhould ſay that *Trinitas* is a *barbarous Word*, (as not extant in *Claſſick Authors*:) what great matter is there in all this?

I will not trouble my ſelf to enquire whether *Trinitas* be, in that ſenſe uſed in *Tully*; but ſure I am that τριας is a good *Greek* word. And words, though not ſo well contrived at firſt, yet when once received into common uſe, and the meaning thereof underſtood, we chuſe to retain, rather than to make a needleſs change. This the common Phraſes of, *your Worſhip*, *your Honour*, *your Lordſhip*, &c. for one *Worſhipful*, *Honourable*, *a Lord*, &c. have been noted long ſince to be not Analogous to the more uſual Forms of ſpeech in Latin and Greek Writers: Yet *Cuſtom* hath made them *Allowable*; and therefore we

do

do not ſcruple to uſe them. So *Luther* and *Calvin*, it ſeems, thought the word *Tres* to be a better Latin word, in this caſe, than *Trinitas*. And I had allowed our Adverſary, (*Let.* iv. *p.* 36.) inſtead of *Trinity in Unity*, to ſay (if that will pleaſe him better) *Three in One*. Yet *Three* and *Trinity* (to my apprehenſion) differ no more than *Ten* and a *Decade*; or *Twelve* and a *Douſain*. But what's all this to the matter in hand? Doth *Luther* or *Calvin* any where ſay, that *Father, Son, and Holy-Ghoſt*, are but *three Names?* or, that they be *three Gods?* If they ſay neither of theſe; they do not contradict what we affirm. 'Tis but as if a Man ſhould chuſe to ſay *Ten Commandments*, rather than a *Decade*, or *half a ſcore*; or to ſay, there are, in the Apoſtles Creed, *Twelve Articles* rather than *a Douſain*. And if theſe be the *great diſagreements* he there complains of, it comes to a very ſmall matter.

To his Argument, *That only the Father is God*, becauſe of *Joh.* 17. 3. *to know thee the only true God*; he ſays, *p.* 17. *I give three Anſwers.* (I do ſo.) But, he ſays, *the firſt and third are deſtructive of one another.* Not ſo: they all agree very well. And any of them will deſtroy his Argument. 'Tis not ſaid, *Thee only*, but *the only true God*. He would have us think it all one to ſay, *Thee only, to be the true God*, and *Thee to be the only true God*, I think otherwiſe. The one gives ſome ſeeming colour for his objection: The other, not the leaſt ſhadow. His Argument, *The Father is the only true God, therefore not the Son or Holy-Ghoſt*, is juſt in this Form, *The God of Abraham is the only true God, therefore not the God of Iſaac, nor the God of Jacob.* Which, I preſume he will not allow to be a good conſequence.

He would have it thought I grant, that if it were as this form, *the only, thee true God*, then the *Socinians had undoubtedly gained the point.* Not ſo. He hath not heard

me

me ſay ſo yet; nor is he like to do. If I ſhould ſay, *He that brought Iſrael out of Egypt, and he only, is the true God*: my meaning would be but this, *That God who brought Iſrael out of Egypt, and that God only, is the true God*: And this muſt be underſtood to be ſaid of him, not *as their deliverer out of Egypt*, but *as God*. For he was *the true God* (and the *only true God*) long before he brought *Iſrael* out of *Egypt*; and would have been ſo, though they had never *been*; or had never been *ſo brought out*. There may be *vera prædicatio*, which is not καθόλου πρῶτον.

And, of all men living, the *Socinians* are obliged to ſay, that this title *the true God*, or *only true God*, belongs to him, not as *Father*, but as *God*. For if (as they would have us think) our *Lord Jeſus Chriſt* had no *Being* before his being made *Man* of the Virgin *Mary*; then neither had he *a Father* till that time: But he was *the only true God* from all Eternity; and therefore not (with this Reduplication) as *Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*. For he was *the only true God* (according to their Doctrine) long before the *Man Chriſt* had a Father; and would ſo have been, though this *Man* had never been. And though Chriſt *ſpeak* to him as *His Father*, yet the title of *the only true God*, he aſcribes to him as *God*. If *Solomon* ſhould have ſaid to *David*, *Thou Father art King of Iſrael*; he was not therefore *King of Iſrael* as *Father of Solomon*; for he was ſo, long before he was *Solomon*'s *Father*. Which takes away all colour of our Obſervator's (imaginary) contradiction here pretended: and leaves not the leaſt umbrage for it.

As little force is there in his other cavil, *p.* 18. *If the Father and Son be the onely true God, then not the Holy-Ghoſt*. Yes; the Holy-Ghoſt alſo. For though it be not here Affirmed; yet neither is it here Denied.

But theſe Objections of his have been ſo often brought,

and ſo often anſwered, that 'tis tedious to ſee the ſame things brought ſo often over and over again.

The like I ſay of what he repeats from 1 *Cor.* 8. 6. which is anſwered ſufficiently, *Let.* iii. *p.* 52. Nor is it at all ſtrange, or uncommon, that the word *Father* ſhould be ſometime ſpoken of God perſonally conſidered, as *Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, and ſometime of God indefinitely (according to his Eſſence) without reſpect to *this* or that Perſon. *Father of Spirits*, Heb. 12. 9. *Doubtleſs thou art our Father, Thou O Lord art our Father and our Redeemer*, Iſai. 63. 16. *Thou ſhalt call me My Father*, Jer. 3. 4, 19. which the *Socinians* muſt not ſay to be meant as to his *Perſonality*, as *Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, (for ſuch, they ſay, he then was not,) but as to his *Eſſence*. *The everlaſting Father*, Iſai. 9. 6. ſpoken of Chriſt, not as to his *Perſonality* (for ſo, he was *Son*) but as to his *Eſſence*.

As to what he objects, *p.* 19. to that of *Rom.* 9. 5. *Chriſt; who is over all, God bleſſed for ever, Amen.* I refer to what is ſaid, *Let.* iii. *p.* 47. (too large to repeat here.) But how *Amen* (which is a word of *Aſſeveration*) ſhould *make it Nonſenſe*, I do not underſtand. And what was ſaid of God indefinitely, *Rev.* 1. 4. is ſaid particularly of Chriſt, *ver.* 8. *Who was dead and is alive*, ver. 17, 18. (which deſcription of Chriſt in particular, he had begun at *ver.* 5. and continues beyond this place.) If he deny it, let the Reader judge.

As to that of 1 *Joh.* 5. 7. I refer to what hath been ſaid already. I think there is not much more to be ſaid thereof on either ſide than had been ſaid long before either He or I began to write. And if after all he reſolve to hold to his opinion; he muſt give me leave to retain mine. And let the Reader judge as he ſees cauſe. And ſo for that of *Matt.* 28. 19.

As to all, in all thoſe Leters to which he makes no Reply;

ply; it ſtands as it did: And if the Reader pleaſe to read them over again, he will be able to judge, whether it be all ſo contemptible as to have nothing of Weight in it.

I have ſaid nothing to his Bluſtring and Contemptuous Language, his *Canting* (or rather Railing) againſt *Schools, Metaphyſicks, Mother Church, Alma Mater Academia, School-terms, Gothiſh and Vandelick terms, Abſtract, Concrete,* (as if *Long* and *Length* were all one; and all one to ſay *David was Kingdom of Iſrael, and the Kingdom of Iſrael was Father to Solomon,* as to ſay this of *the King of Iſrael)* and other the like. (To which he is wont to run out when he hath little elſe to ſay, but would ſeem to ſay ſomewhat to make a Noiſe.) Becauſe the Reader would know (without any telling him) that this is *Raving* rather than *Arguing*. And when he tells us, ſo often, of *The Brief Hiſtory of the Unitarians*; why might not I as well tell him, that *Doctor* Sherlock *had anſwered it*; and means (I ſuppoſe) to *Vindicate* that Anſwer, if he think there be need.

So, when he runs Diviſion upon *Imperial Edicts, Confiſcations, and Baniſhments, ſeizing and burning of Books, Capital puniſhments, Fire, and Fagot*; (with many other things wherein I am not concern'd,) What is all this to me? I do not know that I ever did him any hurt (unleſs by diſcovering his Errors;) I was only *Arguing* as a *Diſputant*; not *making Laws*.

As little need be ſaid of a many little things, as little to the purpoſe: As, whether my Third Letter were not *rather a Book?* Whether *the things which God hath prepared for them that love him,* are the Onely *deep things of God* which we cannot comprehend? or the Onely *ſecret things which belong to God,* while things *Revealed* belong to us? Whether, what I knew *forty years ago,* I had been ſtudying and conſidering *forty years* (without thinking of

of ought elſe all the while)? which certainly I could not be, for I was then forty years old. Whether it be better *Engliſh* to ſay, *God the Creator, God the Redeemer, and God the Sanctifier ARE, or IS but one God?* Whether *Unum* (in the Neuter Gender, put abſolute without a Subſtantive) do not uſually ſignifie *One Thing*? Whether the word *Trinitas*, be a *pure Latin*, or a *Barbarous* Word, (not to be found in *Tully*, any more than *Unitarian*)? Whether *Tres* or *Trinitas* be the better Latin-word? Whether, what in his former Letter, *p.* 9. were but *old-faſhioned Notions*, be now (in this laſt) *New and Cautious*? with other the like.

But (beſides in theſe and many others, he cavils without a cauſe) what's all this to the Buſineſs in hand? Or how doth it contradict what I affirm? *viz.*

That, *What in one Conſideration are Three, may in another Conſideration be but One.*

That, *We may ſafely ſay* (without Abſurdity, Contradiction, or Inconſiſtence with Reaſon,) *there may be in God, Three Somewhats* (which we commonly call Perſons) *that are but One God.*

That, *Theſe Three, are more than three Names, but not three Gods.*

That, *God the Creator, God the Redeemer, and God the Sanctifier,* (otherwiſe called God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy-Ghoſt,) *are ſuch Three.*

I ſee nothing of what he hath ſaid, doth overthrow any of Theſe.

March 14. 169⅔.

Yours,

J. Wallis.

29136